

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

	αğ	<i></i> 24
	de:	₹
/	×	ť
/		

In re the Application of:	)
••	) Examiner: K. Tamai
Kaoru MATSUMOTO	)
Raolu MATSUMOTO	
	) Art Unit: 2834
Serial No.: 10/040,470	)
	j
Eiled, I 0, 2002	· ·
Filed: January 9, 2002	?
	)
For: AXIAL FAN MOTOR AND	)
COOLING UNIT	í

## PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 CFR 1.136

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

It is respectfully requested that the time period for filing a response to the office action of April 11, 2003, initially set to expire May 11, 2003, be extended three months up to and including August 11, 2003. The requisite \$930.00 fee for the requested extension is herewith attached.

Any additional fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 12-2174.

Resp#tfully submitted,

Reg. No. 25,814

Date: August 11, 2003

LORUSSO, LOUD & KELLY 3137 Mount Vernon Avenue Alexandria, VA 22305

08/13/2003 WASFAW1 0000 01 FC:1253

930.00 OP

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:	)
Kaoru MATSUMOTO	) Examiner: K. Tamai
Serial No.: 10/040,470	) Art Unit: 2834
Filed: January 9, 2002	)
For: AXIAL FAN MOTOR AND COOLING UNIT	í )

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF APRIL 11, 2003

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

A petition for a three month extension of time has today been filed as a separate paper and a copy is attached hereto.

Responsive to the office action of April 11, 2003, applicants, by their undersigned attorney, hereby elect the first embodiment which is depicted in Figs. 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9. See, for example, page 13, lines 20-22 and page 11, line 1 to page 12, line 10. For the sake of responsiveness, applicants elect, as a "species", Fig. 2 of the drawings. Claims 1, 2, 3, 14 and 17 read on the elected species.

However, the requirement for election of species is respectfully traversed. With regard to the elected first embodiment, as taught at page 13, lines 10-12, all of Figs. 1 to 5, 8 and 9 describe the same first embodiment. Also see the description of these drawing figures at pages 11 and 12 of applicants' specification. Thus, Figs. 2, 4 and 8 do not represent different species

of the invention as alleged by the examiner. As explained at page 11 of applicants'

specification, Figs. 4(A) and 4(B) show a plate "A" which forms part of the casing of the cooling

unit of the first embodiment, of which Fig. 2 is a plan view. Figs. 8 and 9 are different views of

the same cooling unit shown in Figs. 2 and 3. Accordingly, Figs. 2, 4 and 8 all show features of

the first embodiment or "species," not different embodiments or "species."

The requirement for election of species is further traversed for the reason that claim 1 is

an allowable, generic claim.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement in light of the foregoing is respectfully

requested.

espectfully subm

Decorge A. Mosaq

Dated: August 11, 2003

2 a.ca. 11 a.g. a.s. 11, 2000

LORUSSO, LOUD & KELLY 3137 Mount Vernon Avenue

Alexandria, VA 22305

(703) 739-9393

2